

E-filed: 11/13/07

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

Defendants.

No. C-05-02298 RMW

ORDER OVERRULING SAMSUNG'S
OBJECTIONS TO *MOSAID* PRODUCTION
ORDER

[Re Docket No. 351]

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX
SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC.,
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC.,

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
U.S.A.,

Defendants.

No. C-05-00334 RMW

[Re Docket No. 498]

Samsung¹ objects to a Special Master's order granting Rambus' motion to compel Samsung to produce documents relating to Samsung's destruction of documents in *Mosaid Technologies, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.*, Case No. 01-CV-4340 (D.N.J.). Rambus opposes the objection. The court has reviewed the papers and considered the arguments of counsel heard on November 7, 2007. The court overrules Samsung's objections to the *Mosaid* production. Samsung is ordered to produce everything from *Mosaid Technologies, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.*, Case No. 01-CV-4340 (D.N.J.) that specifically, or in part specifically, addresses the destruction or spoliation of evidence.² The court envisions that this production will comprise court filings, discovery productions, hearing transcripts and deposition transcripts, but it is not limited to particular classes of documents. To be clear, Samsung does not have to produce everything from the *Mosaid* litigation. This order is limited to those things that specifically, or in part specifically, address the destruction or spoliation of evidence.

DATED: 11/13/07



RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

¹ "Samsung" collectively refers to all of the Samsung entities sued in these cases, namely Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., and Samsung Austin Semiconductor, L.P.

² The court believes this reflects the scope of Judge Ambler's order. To the extent Judge Ambler's order could be construed as broader than this formulation, the order is modified to conform to these limits.

1 Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:

2 **Counsel for Plaintiff(s):**

3 Craig N. Tolliver	ctolliver@mckoolsmith.com
Pierre J. Hubert	phubert@mckoolsmith.com
4 Brian K. Erickson	berickson@dbllp.com,
David C. Vondle	dvondle@akingump.com
5 Gregory P. Stone	gregory.stone@mto.com
Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke	luedtkech@mto.com
6 Peter A. Detre	detrepa@mto.com
Burton Alexander Gross	burton.gross@mto.com,
7 Steven McCall Perry	steven.perry@mto.com
Jeannine Y. Sano	sanoj@howrey.com

8 **Counsel for Defendant(s):**

9 Matthew D. Powers	matthew.powers@weil.com
10 David J. Healey	david.healey@weil.com
Edward R. Reines	Edward.Reines@weil.com
11 John D Beynon	john.beynon@weil.com
Jared Bobrow	jared.bobrow@weil.com
12 Leeron Kalay	leeron.kalay@weil.com
Theodore G. Brown, III	tgbrown@townsend.com
13 Daniel J. Furniss	djfurniss@townsend.com
Jordan Trent Jones	jtjones@townsend.com
14 Kenneth L. Nissly	kennissly@thelenreid.com
Geoffrey H. Yost	gyost@thelenreid.com
15 Susan Gregory van Keulen	svankeulen@thelenreid.com
Patrick Lynch	plynch@omm.com
16 Jason Sheffield Angell	jangell@orrick.com
Vickie L. Feeman	vfeeman@orrick.com
17 Mark Shean	mshean@orrick.com
Kai Tseng	hlee@orrick.com

18
19 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not
20 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

21 **Dated:** 11/13/07

TSF
Chambers of Judge Whyte